

REMARKS

The November 26, 2008 Final Office Action ("Office Action") was based on pending Claims 1-5 and 10-20. By this response, Applicants are amending Claims 1, 10 and 19. These claims have been amended in order to clarify the features of Applicants' inventions and were not amended for patentability purposes. It is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Applicants specifically reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims in this Application or in a related application. Claims 6-9 were previously cancelled and Claims 2-5, 11-18 and 20 remain as previously presented. Thus, after entry of the foregoing amendments and the remarks below, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5 and 10-20 are patentably distinguished over the cited references.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-5 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,985,953 to Sandhu, et al. ("Sandhu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,596 to Hinton ("Hinton"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, the characterization of the pending claims, and each and every implicit and/or explicit official notice.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 10-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sandhu in View of Hinton

A. Independent Claim 1

The Office Action stated that Sandhu discloses all of the elements of Claim 1 except for a login ticket, that Hinton discloses a login ticket, and that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sandhu with Hinton to achieve the login ticket feature of Claim 1. (Office Action, Page 3, line 15 – Page 5, line 20.) Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the combination of Sandhu and Hinton is improper. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to advance prosecution.

Claim 1 is directed, in part, to a system in which a user can link one or more websites using a baseline authentication agency such that the websites can be configured for seamless login by the user without reauthentication. Applicants submit that Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, does not disclose, among other things, "a database storing information about partner web sites that have been linked by a user for defining login parameters for the user associated with one or more of the web sites." Rather, Sandhu is directed towards methods of creating secure cookies. The Office Action refers in part to col. 12, lines 25-30 as disclosing this feature. This portion of Sandhu recites that a "merchant site" may set a cookie related to a "customer-information database." The "customer-information database" of Sandhu includes information about customers of a merchant site, not information

about partner web sites that have been linked by a user for defining login parameters per claim 1. In fact, the "customer-information database" does not include information about partner websites linked by a user, or even information about partner websites at all.

The Office Action further refers further to col. 14, lines 4-6 of Sandhu as disclosing the above-referenced feature of Claim 1. The foregoing portion of Sandhu recites that "local servers may belong to one domain regardless of their physical location by DNS (Domain Name Service) configuration." It is unclear to the Applicants how this portion of Sandhu applies to the above feature. However, even if the "local servers" belonging to the same domain correspond to the linked partner web sites of Claim 1, which they do not, Sandhu does not disclose that partner sites are "linked by a user for defining login parameters for the user associated with one or more of the web sites."

As discussed, Claim 1 is directed, in part, to a system in which a user can link one or more websites using a baseline authentication agency such that the websites can be configured for seamless login by the user. Moreover, a set of baseline authentication agencies may be available. In contrast, even if Sandhu discloses a baseline authentication agency, which it does not, Sandhu does not disclose a set of baseline authentication agencies being available. Additionally, Applicants submit that Hinton does not disclose such an arrangement. As such, Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, does not disclose, among other things, "a cookie related to the user and including a reference to the baseline authentication agency including an identifier distinguishing the baseline authentication agency from a set of baseline authentication agencies."

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

B. Dependent Claims 2-5

Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 2-5 are in condition for allowance and request that they are passed to allowance.

C. Independent Claim 10

The Office Action stated that Sandhu discloses all of the elements of Claim 10 except for a login ticket, that Hinton discloses a login ticket, and that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sandhu and Hinton to achieve the login ticket feature of Claim 10. (Office Action, Page 7, line 1 – Page 8, line 18.) Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of Sandhu and Hinton is improper. However, Applicants have amended Claim 10 to advance prosecution.

For reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants submit that Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, does not disclose "determining whether the user has authorized seamless login for the site, the site designated the by the user to establish the site as one of a group of partner sites for which the user has defined login parameters". In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Claim 10 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

D. Dependent Claims 11-18

Claims 11-18 depend from independent Claim 10 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 10 and for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 11-18 are in condition for allowance and request that they are passed to allowance.

E. Independent Claim 19

The Office Action stated that Sandhu discloses all of the elements of Claim 19 except for a login ticket, that Hinton discloses a login ticket, and that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Sandhu and Hinton to achieve the login ticket feature of Claim 19. (Office Action, Page 10, line 3 – Page 12, line 5.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of Sandhu and Hinton is improper. However, Applicants have amended Claim 19 to advance prosecution.

For reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants submit that Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, does not disclose "a list of partner sites that have been designated by a user for defining login parameters for the user associated with one or more of the sites". In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Claim 19 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

F. Dependent Claim 20

Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 19 and is believed to be patentably distinguished over Sandhu, alone or in combination with Hinton, for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 19 and for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 20 is in condition for allowance and request that Claim 20 is passed to allowance.

II. Rescission of any Prior Disclaimers and Request to Revisit Art

The claims of the present application are different and possibly broader in scope than any previously pending claims. To the extent that any amendments or characterizations of the scope of any claim or referenced art could be construed as a disclaimer of any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, Applicants hereby rescind and retract such disclaimer. Accordingly, the above-listed references, or other listed or referenced art may need to be revisited.

III. No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

IV. Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants do not believe that any of the references affect the patentability of the pending claims.

V. Telephone Interview Request

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.01, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants' Attorney of Record hereby formally requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as soon as the Examiner has considered the effect of the arguments presented above. Applicants' attorney can be reached at the general office number listed below.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that the issues may be promptly resolved.

Application No.: 10/519,774
Filing Date: December 22, 2004

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: February 25, 2009

By: Amy C. Chun
Amy C. Chun
Registration No. 52,742
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(949) 760-0404

6436838